

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the specification and claims to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. The specification has been amended to correct the spelling of "polymers" as noted in the Official Action. The specification has been amended to clarify that polyolefin would include both copolymers and homopolymers as would be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art. The specification and claims have been amended to cancel "aggressive components" and replace this phrase with components with a large reactivity as fully supported by Applicants specification at page 4, lines 25-26. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this aspect of the rejection be withdrawn. This amendment obviates the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph since the objected to language has been canceled. Moreover, the level of one of ordinary skill in the art must be taken into consideration in evaluating the terms used in the claims and it is believe that all of the terms are clear to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains.

Further dependent claims 18 and 19 and independent claim 20 have been added to the application to further specific aspects of the invention related to polyethylene and polypropylene which are homopolymers as would be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains. Applicants most respectfully submit that all of the claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed and as would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains. It is noted that no prior art is applied against any of the claimed subject matter.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 7, and 10-17 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following comments. The rejection of the term "aggressive components" has been obviated by the cancellation of this term and the use of the term, components with a large reactivity as described in the specification

Appl. No. 10/583,450
Amendment dated: January 21, 2010
Reply to OA dated: October 21, 2009


in the context of the invention and as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, this aspect of the rejection should be withdrawn.

The phrase, "homopolymeric polyolefin" has been retained as this is believed to the a reasonable interpretation of the specification as it would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains. Applicants do not disagree with the statement in the Official Action that by the term polyolefin are hereby understood polymers which are mainly built up of carbon atoms and hydrogen atoms. But this expression is followed by specifically identified homopolymers such as, for example polyethylene, polypropylene, 1-butene, 4-methyl pentane, etc. The specification has been added to clarify this by stating prior to the specified homopolymers and polymeric homopolymers. This is not new matter. Applicants are entitled to a reasonable interpretation of the specification which includes homopolymers even though the claims are restricted to the narrower invention of homopolymers for the polyolefin as previously claimed and defined in the specification to include polymers which are mainly built of carbon and hydrogen atoms. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the specification and claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: 

Richard E. Fichter
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080
REF/kco
A03_2010.01.19.wpd
January 21, 2010